

Enhanced effects on extracting γ from untagged B^0 and B_s decays

Michael Gronau,¹ Yuval Grossman,¹ Ze'ev Surujon,¹ and Jure Zupan^{2,3}

¹*Department of Physics, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology,
Technion City, Haifa 32000, Israel*

²*J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, P.O. Box 3000, 1001 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

³*Department of Physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19,
1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

Abstract

The weak phase γ can be determined using untagged $B^0 \rightarrow DK_S$ or $B_s \rightarrow D\phi, D\eta^{(\prime)}$ decays. In the past, the small lifetime difference $y \equiv \Delta\Gamma/(2\Gamma)$ has been neglected in B^0 , while the CP violating parameter $\epsilon \equiv 1 - |q/p|^2$ has been neglected in both B^0 - $\bar{B}^0$ and B_s - $\bar{B}_s$ mixing. We estimate the effect of neglecting y and ϵ . We find that in D decays to flavor states this introduces a systematic error, which is enhanced by a large ratio of Cabibbo-allowed to doubly Cabibbo-suppressed D decay amplitudes.

I. INTRODUCTION

The interference between the decay chains $B \rightarrow DK \rightarrow f_D K$ and $B \rightarrow \bar{D}K \rightarrow f_D K$ is commonly utilized in methods for extracting the phase $\gamma = \arg(-V_{ud}V_{ub}^*V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$. The original idea, applied to these processes and to $B_s \rightarrow D\phi$, was put forward in [1, 2]. Several variants of the idea can be found in [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. The determination of γ based on these methods is theoretically very clean. The uncertainty in the value of γ is mainly due to low statistics of the relevant processes. Time-dependent decays $B^0 \rightarrow DK_S$ studied in [10] require flavor tagging of the initial B^0 , for which one pays a price in statistics. This is also the case for time-dependent $B_s \rightarrow D\phi$. Ref. [11] discussed the extraction of γ in untagged B_s decays, taking advantage of the finite nonzero width-difference between the two B_s mass-eigenstates. Recently it was shown that γ can also be determined using untagged non-strange neutral B decays [12], where the width-difference is too small to be measured. In this method, combining charged along with neutral B decays, and using several D decay modes, reduces the statistical error on the value of γ .

The two parameters describing the width-difference and CP violation in mixing in the B^0 systems,

$$y \equiv \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2\Gamma} \ , \quad \epsilon \equiv 1 - \left| \frac{q}{p} \right|^2 \ , \quad (1)$$

are estimated to be below a level of 10^{-2} [13, 14]. (Note that ϵ is not a standard notation). Thus, usually these parameters can be safely neglected when dealing with untagged $B^0 \rightarrow DK_S$. Indeed, both y and ϵ were neglected in [12].

In this work we consider the extraction of γ from both untagged $B_d \rightarrow DK_S$ (here $B_d \equiv B^0$) and untagged $B_s \rightarrow D\phi$, keeping explicitly y and ϵ . We find that in D decays to flavor states, the sensitivity of γ to y and ϵ is enhanced by ratios of Cabibbo-allowed and doubly Cabibbo-suppressed D decay amplitudes. In such cases, neglecting y and ϵ might result in a relatively large systematic error. This effect is expected to be more important in B_s decays, as the width-difference in the B_s system is expected to be much larger than in B_d [14, 15]. The effect in B_s decays may be taken into account through a measurement of the B_s width-difference. Eventually, when very large data sets will be available, a most precise determination of γ will require using untagged B_d and B_s decays together with charged B decays. The purpose of this note is to point out the nontrivial enhancement of the effect of nonzero y and ϵ , which may become relevant at that point.

II. TWO-BODY D DECAYS

Our analysis applies to both $B_d \rightarrow DK_S$ and $B_s \rightarrow D\phi, D\eta^{(\prime)}$. Working along the lines of [12], we define for the first process,

$$A(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K_S) = A_n \ , \quad A(B^0 \rightarrow D^0 K_S) = A_n r_n e^{i(\delta_n + \gamma)} \ , \quad (2)$$

where we take A_n and r_n to be real and positive, $0 \leq \delta_n < 2\pi$ and γ are the strong and weak phases, respectively. Neglecting CP violation in K^0 - $\bar{K}^0$ mixing, amplitudes for CP -conjugate decays are given by inverting the sign of the weak phase γ .

The parameter r_n is expected to be around 0.4 since it contains a Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) factor $|V_{ub}^* V_{cs}/V_{cb}^* V_{us}| \simeq 0.4$. It is not expected to be much smaller than this value unless color-suppression in $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{u}c\bar{s}$ is more effective than in $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c}u\bar{s}$. An estimate of this effect can be obtained by comparing the ratios r_n^* and r_c^* measured in $B^0 \rightarrow DK^{*0}$ and $B^+ \rightarrow DK^{*+}$ decays. [The parameter r_n^* is defined in analogy with (2), while r_c^* is the corresponding parameter in charged B decays.] A recent BaBar analysis found an upper bound $r_n^* < 0.4$ at 90% CL [16], while a value $r_c^* = 0.11_{-0.11}^{+0.08}$ was obtained by averaging a few measurements by BaBar and Belle [17]. Using isospin and neglecting a pure annihilation amplitude describing $B^+ \rightarrow D^+ K^{*0}$, one has [12]

$$r_n^* = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^{*+})}{\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^{*0})}} r_c^* = (4.0 \pm 0.5) r_c^* = 0.4_{-0.4}^{+0.3}. \quad (3)$$

Similar notations and considerations apply to $B_s \rightarrow D\phi, D\eta^{(\prime)}$.

Considering D decays, we define amplitudes into a (possibly quasi) two-body final state f_D and its CP -conjugate state $\bar{f}_D$ by

$$A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow f_D) = A(D^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}_D) \equiv A_f, \quad A(D^0 \rightarrow f_D) = A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}_D) \equiv A_f r_f e^{i\delta_f}. \quad (4)$$

By convention $A_f \geq 0, r_f \geq 0, 0 \leq \delta_f < \pi$. We neglect CP violation related to D mesons, as well as D^0 - $\bar{D}^0$ mixing effects, which have been shown to be very small [18]. The parameters r_f, δ_f depend on the final state f_D . While $r_f = 1$ for CP -eigenstate (*e.g.* $f_D = K^+ K^-$) and $r_f = \mathcal{O}(1)$ for non- CP flavorless states (*e.g.* $f_D = K^{*+} K^-$), r_f is very small for flavor states (*e.g.* $f_D = K^+ \pi^-$), $r_f \simeq 0.06 \sim \tan^2 \theta_c$ [19]. In this note we focus on a particular effect which applies to the latter class of final states.

The amplitudes of the four decay chains are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{Bf} &\equiv A(B^0 \rightarrow f_D K_S) = A_n A_f [r_n e^{i(\delta_n + \gamma)} r_f e^{i\delta_f} + 1], \\ \bar{A}_{Bf} &\equiv A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_D K_S) = A_n A_f [r_f e^{i\delta_f} + r_n e^{i(\delta_n - \gamma)}], \\ A_{B\bar{f}} &\equiv A(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}_D K_S) = A_n A_f [r_f e^{i\delta_f} + r_n e^{i(\delta_n + \gamma)}], \\ \bar{A}_{B\bar{f}} &\equiv A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}_D K_S) = A_n A_f [r_n e^{i(\delta_n - \gamma)} r_f e^{i\delta_f} + 1], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with magnitudes

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{Bf}| &= A_n A_f \sqrt{1 + r_n^2 r_f^2 + 2r_n r_f \cos(\delta_f + \delta_n + \gamma)}, \\ |\bar{A}_{Bf}| &= A_n A_f \sqrt{r_n^2 + r_f^2 + 2r_n r_f \cos(\delta_f - \delta_n + \gamma)}, \\ |A_{B\bar{f}}| &= A_n A_f \sqrt{r_n^2 + r_f^2 + 2r_n r_f \cos(\delta_f - \delta_n - \gamma)}, \\ |\bar{A}_{B\bar{f}}| &= A_n A_f \sqrt{1 + r_n^2 r_f^2 + 2r_n r_f \cos(\delta_f + \delta_n - \gamma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We note that the phase of $\bar{A}_{Bf}/A_{Bf}$ depends also on γ . This dependence does not disappear in the limit $r_f \rightarrow 0$, in contrast to the dependence of the magnitudes of the amplitudes on γ . This will turn out to be a crucial point in our argument in the next section, when discussing the sensitivity of determining γ to y and ϵ for small values of r_f .

We now consider the time-dependent decay rate into $f_D K_S$ for a state $B^0(t)$ which has evolved from an initially pure B^0 state. [A similar expression applies to $\Gamma(B_s(t) \rightarrow f_D \phi)$]. Using our previously defined notations (1) and the standard notations

$$\tau \equiv \Gamma t, \quad x \equiv \frac{\Delta m}{\Gamma}, \quad \lambda_f \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{Bf}}{p A_{Bf}}, \quad (7)$$

where a B flavor index (d or s) is implicit, one obtains [13],

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma [B^0(t) \rightarrow f_D K_S] &= \frac{e^{-\tau}}{2} |A_{Bf}|^2 [(\cosh y\tau + \cos x\tau) + |\lambda_f|^2 (\cosh y\tau - \cos x\tau) \\ &\quad - 2(\mathcal{R}e \lambda_f) \sinh y\tau + 2(\mathcal{I}m \lambda_f) \sin x\tau] . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Similarly, for an initial $\bar{B}^0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma [\bar{B}^0(t) \rightarrow f_D K_S] &= \frac{e^{-\tau}}{2} |A_{Bf}|^2 |p/q|^2 [(\cosh y\tau - \cos x\tau) + |\lambda_f|^2 (\cosh y\tau + \cos x\tau) \\ &\quad - 2(\mathcal{R}e \lambda_f) \sinh y\tau - 2(\mathcal{I}m \lambda_f) \sin x\tau] . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The untagged decay rate for a final $f_D K_S$ state is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma [B^0(t) \rightarrow f_D K_S] + \Gamma [\bar{B}^0(t) \rightarrow f_D K_S] &= \\ &= \frac{e^{-\tau}}{2} |A_{Bf}|^2 \left\{ (1 + |p/q|^2) [(1 + |\lambda_f|^2) \cosh y\tau - 2(\mathcal{R}e \lambda_f) \sinh y\tau] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (1 - |p/q|^2) [(1 - |\lambda_f|^2) \cos x\tau + 2(\mathcal{I}m \lambda_f) \sin x\tau] \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The total number of decays into $f_D K_S$ is obtained by integrating over time. To leading order in y and ϵ , the time-integrated rate is

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_f &= |A_{Bf}|^2 + |\bar{A}_{Bf}|^2 - 2y |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \cos \varphi_f \\ &\quad - \epsilon \left[\frac{x}{x^2 + 1} |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \sin \varphi_f - \frac{x^2}{2(x^2 + 1)} (|A_{Bf}|^2 - |\bar{A}_{Bf}|^2) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(y^2) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) , \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where we have defined $\varphi_f \equiv \arg \lambda_f$. Similarly, for the CP-conjugate final state $\bar{f}_D K_S$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\bar{f}} &= |A_{B\bar{f}}|^2 + |\bar{A}_{B\bar{f}}|^2 - 2y |A_{B\bar{f}} \bar{A}_{B\bar{f}}| \cos \varphi_{\bar{f}} \\ &\quad - \epsilon \left[\frac{x}{x^2 + 1} |A_{B\bar{f}} \bar{A}_{B\bar{f}}| \sin \varphi_{\bar{f}} - \frac{x^2}{2(x^2 + 1)} (|A_{B\bar{f}}|^2 - |\bar{A}_{B\bar{f}}|^2) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(y^2) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Note that this result applies regardless of whether the neutral B (B_s) mesons are produced hadronically or in e^+e^- collisions at $\Upsilon(4S)$ [$\Upsilon(5S)$]. In the latter case one neutral B (B_s) meson is observed decaying into $f_D K_S$ ($f_D \phi$), summing over all the decay modes of the second B (B_s).

As expected, Eqs. (11) and (12) reproduce the result of [12] in the limit $y \rightarrow 0, \epsilon \rightarrow 0$. We see that the entire x -dependence is suppressed by ϵ . In the case of B_s decays, where $x \gg 1$, we may expand in $1/x$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_f = & |A_{Bf}|^2 + |\bar{A}_{Bf}|^2 - 2y |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \cos \varphi_f - \frac{\epsilon}{2} (|A_{Bf}|^2 - |\bar{A}_{Bf}|^2) \\ & + \mathcal{O}(y^2) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon/x) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Note that while the sum of the first two terms in Eqs. (11) and (12) depends on two combinations of B decay parameters, $A_n^2(1+r_n^2)$ and $A_n^2 r_n \cos \delta_n$, the terms proportional to y and ϵ involve A_n, r_n and δ_n as three separate variables. This will affect the counting of parameters required for determining γ which we discuss next.

It was shown in [12] that, when neglecting y and ϵ , γ can be determined from untagged B^0 decays using several final states f_D^k . This holds true also when including nonzero values for y and ϵ , where the number of unknowns is increased by one, as mentioned above. First, assume that y and ϵ are known. Consider N different final states, f_D^k ($k = 1, \dots, N$) which are not CP-eigenstates (e.g. $f_D^k = K^-\pi^+, K^{*+}K^-$), and their corresponding CP-conjugates, $\bar{f}_D^k$. Assume that $A_f^k, \bar{A}_f^k$ and $r_f^k, \bar{r}_f^k$ have been determined through branching ratio measurements in an independent sample of D^0 decays. For $N \geq 4$, the $N+4$ unknown parameters $A_n, r_n, \delta_n, \delta_f^k$, and γ can then be extracted by solving the $2N$ equations (11) and (12). (As a cross check for the solution one may use isospin in order to obtain estimates for A_n and r_n [12].) Including $B^0 \rightarrow D^* K_S$ followed by $D^* \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0, D^* \rightarrow D^0 \gamma$, where the two strong phases δ_n^* differ by π [20], one has $6N$ measurements and $N+7$ variables, a system which is solvable for $N \geq 2$.

In principle, one may measure in this way not only γ but also y and ϵ . Including these two variables as unknowns permits determining γ , for $N \geq 6$ when using only the ground state D meson, and for $N \geq 2$ when using also decays involving D^* . In practice, the values of y and ϵ may be too small for a useful determination. The procedure above is expected to suffer from a large statistical error, and should therefore be used together with studying charged B decays. As we show in the next section, neglecting y and ϵ simplifies the equations for neutral B decays, but introduces a systematic error which can be quite large for flavor-specific D decays.

III. THE INDUCED THEORETICAL ERROR

Let us now consider the error in γ made by assuming $y = \epsilon = 0$, for the special case when D mesons decay to flavor states for which $r_f \ll 1$. In order to estimate the sensitivity of γ to

small nonzero values of y and ϵ , we will take all other parameters as given (in the previous section we have outlined a procedure for obtaining a global solution for all parameters). Assuming that one measures the rate Γ_f for a certain decay mode, Eq. (11) leads to a constraint of the form $\Gamma_f^{\text{exp}} = \Gamma_f(\gamma; y, \epsilon)$.

The dependence of Γ_f on γ in the limit $y = \epsilon = 0$ is given by the first two terms on the right-hand-side of Eq. (11),

$$|A_{Bf}|^2 + |\bar{A}_{Bf}|^2 \propto 1 + r_n^2 + 4r_n r_f \cos \delta_n \cos(\delta_f + \gamma) + \mathcal{O}(r_f^2) , \quad (14)$$

where a proportionality factor $A_n^2 A_f^2$ was omitted. The effect of nonzero y and ϵ is given by the remaining terms in Eq. (11). The terms in (11) which are most sensitive to y and ϵ are of zeroth order in r_f ,

$$-2y |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \cos \varphi_f \propto -2y r_n \cos(\delta_n - 2\beta - \gamma) + \mathcal{O}(r_f) , \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\epsilon x}{x^2 + 1} |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \sin \varphi_f \propto \frac{\epsilon x}{x^2 + 1} r_n \sin(\delta_n - 2\beta - \gamma) + \mathcal{O}(r_f) . \quad (16)$$

Thus, while in (14) the term which depends on γ is linear in r_f , the γ -dependent terms in (15) and (16) do not involve this small ratio. This implies that the sensitivity of determining γ to y and ϵ is enhanced by $1/r_f$. The corrections to γ from $y \neq 0$ and $\epsilon \neq 0$ are given by terms of the form

$$\Delta\gamma^y \sim \frac{y}{r_f} , \quad \Delta\gamma^\epsilon \sim \frac{\epsilon}{r_f} \frac{x}{x^2 + 1} . \quad (17)$$

so that the errors on γ may be significant for $f_D = K^+ \pi^-$ where $r_{K^+ \pi^-} \simeq 0.06$ [19].

Using a recent evaluation of mixing parameters for the B_s system [15], $y_s = 0.064 \pm 0.012$, $\epsilon_s = (4.2 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-5}$, and the measurement [21] $x_s = 26 \pm 1$, one notes that $\Delta\gamma^\epsilon$ can be safely neglected, while $\Delta\gamma^y$ can be $\mathcal{O}(1)$ in B_s decays. Keeping the y -dependence when extracting γ from time-integrated untagged $B_s \rightarrow D\phi, D\eta^{(\prime)}$ decays is thus mandatory. On the other hand, corrections in the B_d system, where one has measured [21] $x_d = 0.776 \pm 0.008$, and one estimates [15] $y_d = (2.1 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-3}$, $\epsilon_d = (-9.6 \pm 2.2) \cdot 10^{-4}$, are at a level of several percent. In this case one needs to consider corrections from $y, \epsilon \neq 0$ when data reach high statistics.

We stress that the above analysis provides only a rule of thumb for the size of the expected error in γ . The actual error in the analysis will depend crucially on the choice of the final states, and should be re-evaluated on a case by case basis. Large corrections from nonzero y and ϵ apply only to flavor states in D decays, where r_f is small. Adding information from singly Cabibbo-suppressed D decays where $r_f \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ is expected to dilute the error.

IV. MULTI BODY D DECAYS

Next we move to the case of multi-body D decays, such as $D \rightarrow K_S \pi^+ \pi^-$. The error introduced by neglecting y and ϵ may be enhanced by quasi two-body decays into flavor

states occurring in some parts of phase space, for instance in $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^{*+}\pi^-$. We first consider the model-independent approach presented in [5, 12]. We find that keeping y and ϵ finite makes this approach non-practical, while the corrections can be implemented if the D decay amplitude is modeled by a sum of Breit-Wigner forms. We will focus on the three-body decay $D \rightarrow K_S\pi^-\pi^+$; however the following discussion is rather generic.

Neglecting CP violation in D decays, one has

$$\begin{aligned} A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1), \pi^-(p_2), \pi^+(p_3)) &= A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1), \pi^-(p_3), \pi^+(p_2)) \\ &\equiv A(s_{13}, s_{12}) e^{i\delta(s_{13}, s_{12})} , \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where $s_{ij} \equiv (p_i + p_j)^2$. Denoting

$$A_{ij} \equiv A(s_{1i}, s_{1j}), \quad \delta_{ij} \equiv \delta(s_{1i}, s_{1j}) , \quad (19)$$

the amplitude of the cascade decay becomes

$$A_{Bf} \equiv A(B^0 \rightarrow f_D K) = A_n [A_{32} e^{i\delta_{32}} + r_n e^{i(\delta_n - \gamma)} A_{23} e^{i\delta_{23}}] , \quad (20)$$

and therefore

$$|A_{Bf}| = A_n \sqrt{A_{32}^2 + r_n^2 A_{23}^2 + 2A_{32}A_{23}r_n \cos(\gamma + \delta_{23} - \delta_{32} + \delta_n)} . \quad (21)$$

Similarly,

$$|\bar{A}_{Bf}| = A_n \sqrt{A_{23}^2 + r_n^2 A_{32}^2 + 2A_{23}A_{32}r_n \cos(\gamma + \delta_{23} - \delta_{32} - \delta_n)} . \quad (22)$$

These are the analogues of Eq. (6).

Using these magnitudes, the differential untagged decay rates, $d^2\Gamma_f/ds_{12}ds_{13}$ and $d^2\Gamma_{\bar{f}}/ds_{12}ds_{13}$, are given by Eq. (10). Dividing the Dalitz plot domain (s_{12}, s_{13}) into bins, the time-integrated numbers of events over the i th bin are given by integrating Eq. (11) over this bin. Thus, we have for the i th bin,

$$N_i = A_n^2 \left(\Sigma_i^+ + \frac{\epsilon}{2x^2 + 1} \Sigma_i^- - 2y\Lambda_i^c + \frac{\epsilon x}{x^2 + 1} \Lambda_i^s \right) + \mathcal{O}(y^2) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2) , \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_i^+ &\equiv (1 + r_n^2) T_i^+ + 4r_n \cos \delta_n (c_i \cos \gamma - s_i \sin \gamma) , \\ \Sigma_i^- &\equiv (1 - r_n^2) T_i^- - 4r_n \sin \delta_n (c_i \sin \gamma + s_i \cos \gamma) , \\ \Lambda_i^c &\equiv \int_i ds_{12} ds_{13} |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \cos \varphi , \\ \Lambda_i^s &\equiv \int_i ds_{12} ds_{13} |A_{Bf} \bar{A}_{Bf}| \sin \varphi , \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_i^\pm &\equiv \int_i ds_{12} ds_{13} (A_{32}^2 \pm A_{23}^2) , \\
c_i &\equiv \int_i ds_{12} ds_{13} A_{23} A_{32} \cos(\delta_{23} - \delta_{32}) , \\
s_i &\equiv \int_i ds_{12} ds_{13} A_{23} A_{32} \sin(\delta_{23} - \delta_{32}) .
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

In order to see how many bins are needed if x, y and ϵ were known, we consider m B -decay modes and divide the D -decay Dalitz plot into k bins. For each B decay mode one has three unknowns, A_n, r_n, δ_n . Assuming that the amplitudes $T_i^\pm$ are known from D decay data implies four unknowns per bin, $c_i, s_i, \Lambda_i^c, \Lambda_i^s$. If the bins are CP symmetric, the number of independent unknowns c_i, s_i reduces by half [5], while no such symmetry reduction applies to Λ_i^c, Λ_i^s . Using both $B^0 \rightarrow DK_S$ and $B^0 \rightarrow D^* K_S$, the number of unknowns including γ is $3k + 7$, while the number of measurements is $3k$. Such a system of equations is unsolvable. In principle, one could obtain sufficient information for the purpose of using known y and ϵ to extract γ from neutral B decays involving $D \rightarrow K_S \pi^+ \pi^-$ alone. This would require including higher D resonances, or multi-body B decays [8]. However, this information and precise knowledge of y and ϵ are not expected to be experimentally accessible very soon.

We conclude that in the cases where one cannot neglect y and ϵ (see the discussion in section III), the model-independent analysis of untagged multi-body D -decays becomes impractical. A Breit-Wigner modeling of the density of events in the Dalitz plot [5, 22, 23], could be done if y and ϵ were known. Without this a priori knowledge, the error in γ could be large in regions of phase space where doubly Cabibbo-suppressed decays are important. A detailed study of the error would be needed.

V. SUMMARY

We have shown that the method presented in [12] for extracting the CKM phase γ from untagged B_d decays leads to a systematic error caused by neglecting y and ϵ . We found that the terms proportional to y and ϵ are enhanced by a ratio of large to small D decay amplitudes. This enhancement is particularly notable when using doubly Cabibbo-suppressed D decays. It can lead to an error on γ at the level of several percent in $B^0 \rightarrow DK_S$ decays, and to an uncertainty of order one when extracting γ in untagged $B_s \rightarrow D\phi, D\eta^{(\prime)}$.

The method proposed in Ref. [12] can thus be implemented without change in present $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} K^{(*)}$ data sets. However, future precision determinations of γ will require taking into account corrections from y and ϵ . While in B_s decays ϵ_s can be safely set to zero, the effect of a nonzero y_s cannot be neglected, and experimental information of this parameter must be used already at the current level of precision. In the future, the discussed effects may have an impact on a global fit to γ including both charged and neutral B decays. We

also note that at least in principle, with unlimited statistics, a measurement of y and ϵ may be performed by using only time-independent experimental data.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation under Grants No. 378/05 and 1052/04 and by the German-Israeli Foundation under Grant No. I-781-55.14/2003. The work of JZ was supported in part by the Slovenian Ministry of Science and Education.

-
- [1] M. Gronau and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **265**, 172 (1991); M. Gronau, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 037301 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9802315].
 - [2] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Lett. B **253**, 483 (1991).
 - [3] D. Atwood, I. Dunietz and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3257 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9612433]; Phys. Rev. D **63**, 036005 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0008090].
 - [4] Y. Grossman, Z. Ligeti and A. Soffer, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 071301(R) (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0210433].
 - [5] A. Giri, Y. Grossman, A. Soffer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054018 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0303187].
 - [6] D. Atwood and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 033003 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304085].
 - [7] I. Dunietz, Phys. Lett. B **270**, 75 (1991).
 - [8] D. Atwood, G. Eilam, M. Gronau and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B **341**, 372 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9409229]; R. Aleksan, T. C. Petersen and A. Soffer, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 096002 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0209194]; M. Gronau, Phys. Lett. B **557**, 198 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211282].
 - [9] D. Atwood and A. Soni, arXiv:hep-ph/0312100.
 - [10] B. Kayser and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 116013 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9909561].
 - [11] I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 3048 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9501287].
 - [12] M. Gronau, Y. Grossman, N. Shuhmaher, A. Soffer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 113003 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0402055].
 - [13] I. I. Y. Bigi, V. A. Khoze, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Sanda, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **3**, 175 (1989).
 - [14] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, C. Greub, A. Lenz and U. Nierste, Phys. Lett. B **459** (1999) 631 [arXiv:hep-ph/9808385]; A. Lenz, arXiv:hep-ph/0412007.
 - [15] For a very recent update, see A. Lenz and U. Nierste, arXiv:hep-ph/0612167.
 - [16] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **74**, 031101 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0604016].

- [17] S. T’Jampens, talk at Beauty 2006, the 11th International Conference on B-Physics at Hadron Machines, Sept. 25th-29th 2006, Oxford University, United Kingdom.
- [18] Y. Grossman, A. Soffer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 031501 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0505270].
- [19] W. M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
- [20] A. Bondar and T. Gershon, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 091503 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0409281].
- [21] Heavy Flavor Averaging Group,
<http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>, arXiv:hep-ex/0603003.
- [22] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 121802 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0504039]; arXiv:hep-ex/0607104.
- [23] A. Poluektov *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **73**, 112009 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0604054].